University Leadership Brief

February 16–February 22, 2026 — https://ainews.social

Supporting Evidence

Evidence Landscape

This analysis draws from 1544 sources published during the week of February 16–February 22, 2026, with 718 articles specifically addressing AI in higher education. The evidence base reveals a striking imbalance: while institutional perspectives dominate the discourse through program announcements like [3] and [1], critical empirical studies remain sparse. The available research, such as [6], focuses predominantly on immediate classroom impacts rather than systemic institutional transformation. This evidence can illuminate current practices and emerging concerns but cannot yet predict long-term educational outcomes or validate the transformative claims made by AI advocates.

[3] BU Wheelock Launches New Graduate Programs in AI and ...

[1] An AI Certificate to Prepare World-Ready Leaders

[6] Empowerment or dependency? A systematic review of the ...

Stakeholder Perspective Gaps

The evidence reveals a complete absence of documented perspectives from key stakeholders. Missing from the discourse are student voices on learning experiences, faculty perspectives on pedagogical transformation, support staff insights on workload impacts, and industry viewpoints on graduate preparedness. Without these perspectives, institutional decisions risk fundamental misalignment. As [7] suggests, this gap undermines both policy legitimacy and implementation effectiveness, creating strategies that may serve institutional narratives while failing actual educational communities.

[7] L'Intelligence Artificielle dans l'Enseignement Supérieur : Entre ...

Documented Failure Patterns

While the systematic documentation of AI failures in education remains limited, emerging evidence points to critical vulnerabilities. [5] documents the collapse of automated monitoring systems, revealing how surveillance-based approaches to academic integrity fundamentally misunderstand educational relationships. Technical papers like [4] expose ongoing struggles with content filtering and student safety,

[5] El fracaso del policía digital en las aulas - Mundo IA

[4] CodeGuard: Improving LLM Guardrails in CS Education

while [2] demonstrates the unreliability of AI detection tools that institutions increasingly depend upon. These patterns suggest that risk management strategies must account for cascading failures where technical limitations amplify into pedagogical and ethical crises.

[2] Assessing LLM Text Detection in Educational Contexts: Does Human Contribution Affect Detection?

Power and Framing Analysis

The discourse reveals concentrated narrative control among technology vendors and institutional leadership, with the dominant "tool" metaphor obscuring deeper power shifts. As [11] indicates, this framing masks how AI systems redistribute educational agency and decision-making authority. The causal attribution patterns are particularly revealing: successes are credited to institutional innovation and vendor partnerships, while failures are attributed to individual user error or "implementation challenges." This asymmetry, documented in [9], prevents honest assessment of systemic risks and perpetuates a cycle where critical voices are marginalized as "resistance to change."

[11] Special issue on equity of artificial intelligence in higher education

[9] PDF Inclusion and Equity as a Paradigm Shift for Artificial Intelligence in ...

Research Gaps Affecting Strategy

Leadership faces critical decisions without adequate evidence on fundamental questions. No longitudinal studies examine learning outcomes beyond single semesters. Research on faculty workload transformation remains anecdotal. The impact on educational equity, despite rhetoric about democratization, lacks empirical validation. [10] highlights how institutions make substantial investments based on competitive pressure rather than evidence. These gaps force leaders to navigate between the risk of falling behind technologically and the risk of undermining educational mission—without data to guide the balance.

[10] PDF The generative AI gap: how Universities are struggling to keep up

Secondary Tensions

Beyond the primary efficiency-quality tension, the evidence reveals additional contradictions shaping institutional responses. The transparency paradox documented in [8] shows how disclosure requirements conflict with competitive advantage. Academic freedom clashes with standardization pressures as AI systems normalize particular approaches to knowledge. The promise of personalized learning contradicts the homogenizing effects of large language models trained on conventional wisdom. These tensions cannot be resolved through simple trade-offs but require fundamental rethinking of educational values in an AI-mediated context.

[8] La paradoja de la transparencia en el uso de la IA generativa en la ...

References

1. An AI Certificate to Prepare World-Ready Leaders
2. Assessing LLM Text Detection in Educational Contexts: Does Human Contribution Affect Detection?
3. BU Wheelock Launches New Graduate Programs in AI and ...
4. CodeGuard: Improving LLM Guardrails in CS Education
5. El fracaso del policía digital en las aulas - Mundo IA
6. Empowerment or dependency? A systematic review of the ...
7. L'Intelligence Artificielle dans l'Enseignement Supérieur : Entre ...
8. La paradoja de la transparencia en el uso de la IA generativa en la ...
9. PDF Inclusion and Equity as a Paradigm Shift for Artificial Intelligence in ...
10. PDF The generative AI gap: how Universities are struggling to keep up
11. Special issue on equity of artificial intelligence in higher education